

creeping, often united into an irregular membrane; fertile erect, generally slightly branched, but sometimes subdichotomous; pycnidia semi-ovate; perithecia curved, acuminate.

It is difficult to say what is a species in this genus, which will ultimately coalesce with *Capnodium*, of which it appears to present one form of fruit. A few curved acuminate perithecia without fruit were scattered amongst the threads.

PLATE XVI. fig. 18. *a.* Threads in various states; *b.* pycnidia; *c.* perithecia. All magnified.

XLIV.—*A Reply to Prof. Sedgwick's Article published in the Annals and Magazine of Natural History, 2nd Series, No. 76, April 1854.* By Prof. MILNE-EDWARDS.

To the Editors of the Annals of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,

PROFESSOR SEDGWICK having inserted in the Number of your Journal that I have just received (April 1854), an extensive article on certain passages in the 'Monograph of the British Fossil Corals' published two years ago by M. J. Haime and myself, I hope you will allow me to lay my reply before your readers.

Two points are discussed in Prof. Sedgwick's article: the first is relative to the refusal of the loan of fossil corals belonging to the Cambridge Museum; the second to what we considered as being our scientific property, and had seen presented to the public in Prof. M'Coy's last work, without any reference to its origin.

§ 1. When some of the Members of the Council of the Palæontographical Society proposed to me the laborious task of describing the Fossil Corals of England, Mr. Bowerbank, Sir H. de la Beche, Mr. Davidson, and some more of my friends, kindly undertook to obtain for me the loan of the necessary specimens. The efforts of those gentlemen were so successful, that I soon received in Paris ample materials for most parts of the intended work: the Corals belonging to the Geological Society, the Museum of Bristol, the collections of Mr. Bowerbank, Mr. Stokes, Sir H. De la Beche, Mr. Searles Wood, Mr. Fred. Edwards, Mr. Wetherell, Mr. Pratt, Mr. D. Sharpe, Mr. Walton, Dr. Wright, Dr. Battersby, Mr. Pengelly, Mr. Fletcher, Mr. J. Gray, Prof. Phillips, and several other geologists, were in the most liberal manner placed at my disposal for publication, and I eagerly seize this opportunity to renew my thanks for the aid so afforded to my researches. In order to complete some

parts of our Monograph, M. Haime and myself were desirous of obtaining a similar favour from the Cambridge Museum, and consequently an application for the loan of specimens was made, in the first instance by us to Prof. M'Coy, and subsequently to Prof. Sedgwick by the Honorary Secretary of the Palæontographical Society, my most esteemed friend Mr. Bowerbank. But I was informed that Prof. Sedgwick considered the loan of such specimens not compatible with the regulations of the Cambridge Museum.

M. Haime and I were fully aware that we had no right to throw any censure on that decision; but as it occasioned some omissions in our Monograph, we deemed it necessary to state the circumstance that had rendered our work more incomplete than we had at first hoped it would have been; and consequently we did so in the part of our publication where those omissions began to have some importance.

This simple statement appears to have displeased Prof. Sedgwick, and in a letter addressed to me, on the 8th of December last, he denied the veracity of it; saying that no application for the loan of the Cambridge fossil corals had ever been made; that had such a request reached him, he would have laid it before the Trustees and Auditors of the Museum, and should probably have obtained their consent. I immediately answered Prof. Sedgwick, reminding him of the circumstances above alluded to, and adding, that if I had been misinformed, M. Haime and I would, with pleasure, rectify our statement in the next Fasciculus of our Monograph. But I heard nothing more on the subject, till I received from my bookseller the Number of your 'Annals' containing Prof. Sedgwick's article.

That article shows clearly, that when writing to me in December last, Prof. Sedgwick had forgotten the real state of the case; that an application for the loan of specimens *had been made* on my behalf by Mr. Bowerbank as well as by myself, and *had been rejected* by the justly celebrated geologist of Cambridge. Professor Sedgwick now supposes that the unfortunate negotiation was relative to certain Oolitic fossils only, and not to the Palæozoic corals as well as the former. This distinction is not, in our opinion, well founded, nor is it concordant with the recollections of Mr. Bowerbank, who had written to Cambridge on the subject; but even were it so, I should not consider it now as being of much importance, since the tenour of the article just published by Prof. Sedgwick clearly shows that at all events the result of the application would have been the same; that is to say, *negative*.

It is also necessary to remark here, that the corals, which we were most desirous to obtain, were those from the Oolite and

Mountain Limestone previously described by Prof. M'Coy in your 'Annals' (1848 and 1849). We wished to lay before the public, in our 'Monograph of the British Fossil Corals,' figures of those species executed under our direction, and showing the characters which we deemed necessary to point out. Through the kindness of Mr. Davidson and Mr. Walton, we were enabled to do so for the Oolitic corals, and, as stated in the passage criticised by Professor Sedgwick, the omissions occasioned by what we considered as a refusal of the loan of the Mountain Limestone specimens belonging to the Cambridge Museum, have turned out to be less prejudicial than we at first feared, in consequence of Prof. M'Coy having since then published good figures of them. We had no thought of blaming Prof. M'Coy for so doing, and, as we shall now proceed to show, that circumstance had nothing to do with what we complained of in our book.

I do not therefore see any reason to induce M. Haime and myself to modify the passage of our Monograph relative to the refusal of the loan of the Cambridge corals, or to apologise for it.

§ 2. Professor Sedgwick considers as being equally ill-founded, and also injurious to his friend Prof. M'Coy, an opinion expressed by M. Haime and myself in a note, page 151, of our Monograph. This is of more consequence than the discussion about the extent of the refusal above alluded to, and must therefore be seriously examined here.

In that note we said—"In the beginning of his book (page 17) Prof. M'Coy expresses his regret at not having been acquainted with the latter publication (*viz. the first Fasciculus of our Monograph of the British Fossil Corals*) early enough to be able to refer to it; and we feel much gratified in seeing that the results which Prof. M'Coy appears therefore to have obtained solely from his own observations, are often very similar to those published by ourselves a year before; even by a singular coincidence he often makes use of the same names for the divisions previously established in the first part of this Monograph."

The signification of these words must have been very clear to every one conversant with the contents of the two books alluded to; but in consequence of Prof. Sedgwick's article I deem it necessary to be more explicit.

Prof. M'Coy's work, the title of which is '*A detailed Systematic Description of the British Palaeozoic Fossils,*' does not contain the description of one single new species of coral, nor does the author establish in it any new genera. It consists mostly in the reprint of the articles published some years before by Prof. M'Coy in the 'Annals,' and duly quoted by us in our 'Monograph of the British Fossil Corals.' What Prof. M'Coy added to this reprint in his *Systematic* work, consists essentially in the plates

and in the general classification of the Palæozoic corals; the manner in which the previously established genera are united to form natural divisions of superior value; the characters assigned to these divisions and the names given to them; in short, the whole *systematic* arrangement.

The First Fasciculus of our 'Monograph of the British Fossil Corals' was principally devoted to the exposition of our general classification of the class of Corals, and did not contain the description of any Palæozoic fossils.

It is therefore evident that the above-quoted note, relative to the similarity of the results presented in both publications, could not be applicable to anything else than the systematic part of Prof. M'Coy's work, and what we added about the names given to his divisions is not susceptible of any other interpretation. Consequently we must examine whether the blame so implied in that note be founded or not.

Our classification was published in England in 1850*, and was known to Prof. M'Coy previously to the printing of most part of his work, since he mentioned the existence of it in the very beginning of his book (p. 17).

Now the classification presented by Prof. M'Coy bears the greatest resemblance to ours; some parts are new and belong to that palæontologist, but most of his divisions are exactly the same as ours, and even bear the same names.

Nowhere, however, does he intimate, even in the most distant way, that the classification thus developed in his book is essentially or in part ours. He intermingles the divisions founded on the results of his own observations with those previously established by us, and in examining his book, every unbiased reader would be led to suppose that the various families and subfamilies there described, and even the system of classification altogether, was the scientific property of the author. Prof. M'Coy even goes so far as to say that he has not profited materially by any new portion of our Monograph not previously published in the 'Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. des Sciences;' whereas there are some important parts of his classification that we claim, and that had never been mentioned in the 'Comptes Rendus.' The di-

* I do not clearly understand what Prof. M'Coy means, in his argumentation about the date of this work; and I must add, that what he says about the date of the publication of our French work (the *Monographie des Polypiers Palæozoïques*) is not only completely irrelevant to the point in discussion, but also erroneous. It was the First Fasciculus of that work which we mentioned in our note as having appeared previously to Prof. M'Coy's book, and the date assigned to it by that gentleman (the 26th of June 1851) is not that of its publication, but in reality that of the publication of the Third and last Fasciculus of the same book. This attempt to make our statement appear contrary to truth is therefore unsuccessful.

inction here alluded to is however of no importance, for in no instance does Prof. M'Coy mention having borrowed either from our papers in the 'Comptes Rendus,' or in any other publication, what we claim as being our scientific property in his system of classification.

Prof. M'Coy does not attempt to refute our claims, but in order to account for not having informed his readers to whom the classification presented in his work essentially belongs, he now says that in his opinion there is no need for referring to the authors of zoological groups that are larger or less definite than the small divisions to which the name of a genus is now given. In a descriptive catalogue of species, that might be admitted; but in a work that professes to be a *systematic* arrangement, and that contains the characters as well as the designation of the various zoological divisions, I should think it incumbent on the author to mention the principal source from which he has derived the knowledge of those divisions.

The explanation given by Prof. M'Coy does not therefore change the opinion which I had formed on the subject now under discussion, and does not in the slightest degree invalidate the statement criticised by Prof. Sedgwick.

§ 3. In a letter from Prof. M'Coy, published by Prof. Sedgwick, the former gentleman says, "I may add that MM. Edwards and Haime have figured and described, as new, in their 'Monographie,' several corals previously published by myself in the 'Annals of Natural History,' and that the first idle time I have, I shall write a paper on this and other scientific unfairnesses in their works, with which at present we have nothing to do."

The first part of this paragraph is correct. When the descriptive part of the above work was printed*, we had not yet seen the Number of the 'Annals and Magazine' published in December 1850, and containing the description of some new Palæozoic fossils by Prof. M'Coy; but before receiving the above lines we had done him full justice in that respect, for in the Fifth Fasciculus of our work on British Fossil Corals, the manuscript of which is in the hands of the Palæontographical Society,

* Almost all the text of our 'Monographie des Polypiers Palæoz.' was printed in 1850, or in January 1851, previously to my departure for Italy, where, on account of the bad state of my health, I passed several months in the beginning of 1851 (April to July). Some copies for private distribution had even been given to a few friends; but in consequence of the circumstance here alluded to, and the time taken up by the preparation and printing of the tables during my absence, the last Fasciculus containing the description of the above-mentioned species did not appear till June following. This explains how it happened that Prof. M'Coy's paper, published in December 1850, was not known to us early enough to be quoted in that work.

we have dropped our names and adopted his. As to the *scientific unfairnesses* in our other works which Prof. M'Coy promises to point out, I should be very glad by his making known what he considers as *unfairnesses*; for if I have wronged either that author or any other, it must have been unconsciously, and I am always desirous of repairing the errors that I may have committed. I trust, however, that Prof. M'Coy's efforts in that direction will not prove more successful than the arguments by which he and Prof. Sedgwick have endeavoured to invalidate the statement made by M. Haime and myself in our work on the British Corals, and that I shall not be obliged to waste more time on the subject.

I have the honour to be, Gentlemen,
Your most obedient servant,
MILNE-EDWARDS.
Paris, April 28th, 1854.

XLV.—A Synopsis of the *Fissirostral* family *Bucconidæ*.

By PHILIP LUTLEY SCLATER, M.A., F.Z.S.

[Concluded from p. 365.]

Genus II. MALACOPTILA.

A. *Malacoptila*, G. R. Gray.

1. MALACOPTILA FUSCA (Gm.).

White-breasted Barbet, Lath. Syn. ii. 505.

Bucco fuscus, Gm. S. N. i. p. 408; Lath. Ind. Orn. i. p. 206.

Lypornix torquata, juv., Wagl. S. A. sp. 4.

Monasa uitorques, Du Bus, Bull. Ac. Brux. xiv. pt. 2. p. 107; Rev. Zool. 1848, p. 249.

Monasa fusca, Strickl. Cont. to Orn. 1852, p. 43.

Le Tamatia brun, Le Vail. Ois. de Par. v. 2. pl. 43.

Bucco fuscus, Vieill. N. D. d'H. N. iii. 239; Vieill. Enc. Meth. 1419.

Tamatia fusca, Less. Tr. d'Orn. p. 168.

Monasa fusca, Gray's Gen. i. p. 74 (pars); Bp. Consp. Av. p. 147 (pars).

Malacoptila fusca, Gray, List of Gen. (1841) p. 13.

M. brunnea clare fulvo striata: macula utrinque frontali et magna triangulari superpectoralis albis: ventre obscure fulvescente: pedibus albidis: rostro nigro basi aurantio.

Long. tota 6·5; alæ 3·6; caudæ 2·7.

Hab. in Cayenna (Le Vail.); Rio Nigro (A. W.).

This species has been much confounded with *M. torquata*. M. de Lafresnaye in the 'Revue Zoologique,' and Mr. Strickland in the 'Contributions to Ornithology,' have clearly pointed out the differences between them, which will be sufficiently obvious